

Research Article

Secular Perspective on The Islamic Political Discourses in Indonesia: A Critical Analysis

Hasbi Aswar

Department of International Relations, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Keywords

Indonesia, Islamic State Discourse, Political Islam, Secularization Theory

***Correspondence**

hasbiaswar@uii.ac.id

Article History

Received 20 January 2021

Accepted 28 April 2021

Published online 24 June 2021

This article aims to critically analyze the secularization perspective on political Islam, focusing on the Indonesian context. The secular perspective has its fundamental doctrine that democracy, separation of State and Religion, and nationalism should be the only system to manage one State. Many people always use kind of argument, even scholars, including in Indonesia, to reject the concept of the Islamic State. This article used descriptive analysis to elaborate the secularization perspective on political Islam in Indonesia and the critical analysis from the Islamic perspective. Furthermore, it also explains the impact of using such a perspective in analyzing the discourse of Political Islam. This article found that the responses of the Muslim figures or people on political Islam in Indonesia are influenced by the secularization perspective instead of using the Islamic perspective. Islamic perspective on political Islam is derived from the Islamic methodology that authoritative scholars have formulated in the past. The secular perspective on politics, as a result, contributed to the decline of the Islamic civilization and colonization from the western power.

1. INTRODUCTION

Debate on Political Islam and the relevance of the concept of Islamic State has still become a critical issue in the world which not only Muslim people include but also non-muslim people. Some scholars question the concept of the Islamic State as an irrelevant concept in this modern day where their arguments are based on a belief that the implementation of the Islamic doctrine should be depended on the condition or situation of the Muslim world, more specifically in terms of the aspect of human relationship (*muamalah*) in Islamic Shariah. This thinking is usually represented by the so-called modernization or secularization perspective in Islam. In terms of Islam and the modern concept of State, this modernist contends that there is no contradiction between Islam and Democracy. On the contrary, democratic principles and practices conform to Islamic ideals (Esposito & John O. Voll, 2001).

Other scholars reject the claim of the modernists, as they believe that the concept of Islamic doctrine has been final since the era of the Prophet Muhammad pubh. It affects their view on the concept of Islamic State as the concept inherited by the Prophet and even obligated in Islamic Doctrine. From their point of view, all of the human activities have been explained and regulated in the primary sources of Islam, the Quran, Sunnah (prophetic tradition), and the agreement of the rightly guided Caliphate (*ijma' as-Sahabah*) (Voll, 2007).

This debate still occurred until today where Individuals and groups are involved in advocating for their ideas. Some figures represented this idea for the modernist Muslim, such as Abdullah Ahmed Naim, Farag Foud. Whereas for the traditionalist, figures and groups advocated al-Qaeda; Muslim Brotherhood, and Hizb ut-Tahrir. These three groups shared the same ideas that pursue Islamic sharia in a state but with a different method. For al-Qaeda, the only method to establish the Islamic State is through military action in which Muslims should fight against regimes in the Muslim world and colonial/western states that occupy Muslim lands. For Muslim Brotherhood, the struggle for establishing Islam is through participating in the political election.

In contrast, Hizb ut-Tahrir believes that establishing the Islamic State should be not by Jihad/Warfare or by involving in secular politics but should follow the prophetic method in establishing a state by intellectual and political struggle. As Islamic political groups, these three groups faced mostly repressive policies from the State. Hizb ut-Tahrir and al-Qaeda are prohibited and stigmatized in many states, Muslim brotherhood also faces the same fate.

The rise of ISIL (Islamic State of Iraq and Levant), which has declared the Caliphate in Syria and Iraq, increases the debate's scale between the pro and anti-Islamic state issues. For one part, it justifies the anti-political Islam and Islamic State argument. ISIL/ISIS, since its declaration in 2014, has made many destructions and even excommunicated other jihadist groups in Syria. Many news about this group are described as monstrous and anti-humanity for destroying many buildings, historical heritage, churches, execution to non-muslim, and even showing off their execution to many people through their recorded video. What has been done by ISIS is used by the anti-Islamic State to delegitimize the concept of Islamic State in Islam.

On another side, many other Muslims argue that the ISIS declaration is not really or genuinely Islamic. Even none prominent scholars in the Muslim world have acknowledged the "New Caliphate," including many jihadist groups in Syria such as Jabhat an-Nusrah, Alliance of jihadist groups (The Majlis Shura al-Mujahideen), and Ahrar al-Sham. Indeed, the "New Caliphate," which is declared by ISIS, has been just seen by other groups as a "systematic campaign to distort sharia terms, jihad, sharia, punishment and the concept of the caliphate itself." Most importantly, the declared Caliphate is perceived as just for the self-interest of ISIS and will hinder the revolution in Syria and Iraq (Thomas, 2014).

On a global level, the Islamic State's dominant discourse As a result, in many places, the Islamic political movements are treated coercively by political regimes through stigmatization, arrestment, torture, and even kill. The same situation is also going on in Indonesia, where the discourse of political Islam has become controversial for a very long time ago even before the declaration of the Indonesian Independent. Many advocated the need for implementing shariah to the State, while others opposed it. Under the regime of Joko Widodo, Islamic political movements are repressed by the government and accused of being a threat to Indonesian ideology and state unity. In 2017, the government revoked the legal status of Hizb ut-Tahrir Indonesia, including banning the Islamic Defender Front (FPI) in 2020. The main narrative of the state enmity toward the Islamic political movement is that radical groups aim to threaten Indonesian political integrity.

Currently, the issue of the Islamic State or Khilafah has been discussed by scholars from many perspectives. Some of the publications focusing on the Hizb ut-Tahrir's discourse on Khilafah, such as Ahmad H. Dardiri's (2017) work, discussed the separation of power in the Khilafah concept Hizb ut-Tahrir and the possibility to implement it in Indonesia. Dardiri argued that there are many similarities between the separation of power in the concept of Khilafah and Indonesian democracy, including executive, legislative, and judiciary. However, Khilafah is hard to be implemented in Indonesia, as some of its concepts were not up to date and relevant in Indonesia today (Dardiri, 2017). The same works that discussed Khilafah of Hizb ut-Tahrir could also be found in Mohammad Zainal Hamdy & Wiwik Prasetyo Ningsih (2020), who argued that Khilafah ala HT has no historical and ideological basis. Islam did not mention any specific kind of Islamic State except only a universal rule of governance. Also, the process of election during the four rightly guided caliphates (Khulafa' Ar- Rasyidun) showed no single kind of succession (Ningsih, Mohammad Zainal Hamdy, 2020). Another work by Tomi Setiawan, Asep Risnanda, tried to discuss Khilafah of Hizb ut-Tahrir from the concept of the modern state approach. Risnanda & Setiawan contended that the concept of Khilafah is a modern state looking at the political structure, structure of law, bureaucracy, and administration (Tomi Setiawan, 2019).

The other works try to discuss the idea of Khilafah from the Muslim scholar perspective, such as Amsori and Ernawati (2019). They discuss it by exploring the Muslim scholars perspective like Ibnu Khaldun, Abu A'la Al-Maududi, Rashid Ridha, Abu al-Hasan Ali al-Mawardi, al-Ghazali, Muhammad Abduh, Abdul Wahhab Khallaf, and Abdul Qadim Zallum in the aspect of the principle of government in Islam, the authority of Caliphate, and Islam and democracy (Amsori, 2019). Leonid Sykiainen does the same work, 2017, who compare the classical idea from Khilafah derive from the book of imam al-Mawardi and the contemporary interpretation of Khilafah in which he discusses Ali Abdul Raziq and Rashid Ridha as well as the department of the fatwa of Egypt on the issue of the Islamic State (Sykiainen, 2017). The work on the Comparative approach can also be seen in Ismail & Mahyudin Ritonga et al. (2020), who compare the doctrine of Khilafah and democracy that are concluded as two contrasting ideas. Islamic principles on politics are very much different from democracy seen from the idea of sovereignty, freedom, and succession of leaders (Ismail, Mahyudin Ritonga, Irfan Ahmad, Slamet Fardyanto, 2020).

This paper aims to discuss the influence of the secularization perspective in discussing and rejecting the concept of the Islamic State and emphasizing the importance of using Islamic Methodology in discussing Political Islam. Furthermore, this article also critically reflects the use of the secular perspective on political Islam and the impact in analyzing political Islam.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This research paper is a case study research in the social science research methodology that discusses a specific issue and analyzes it through a particular concept or perspective (Bryman, 2012). In this paper, the secular perspective on political Islam in Indonesia is the object of analysis, and the Islamic perspective on Political Islam is the concept used to analyze the object. Collecting the research data uses documents or works of literature relevant to the topic from books, journal articles, and online sources. The narrative analysis will be used here to identify the main arguments of the secular perspective in rejecting political Islam and how they construct their argument to support their prepositions. Furthermore, those narratives will then be analyzed critically through the Islamic perspective. In writing this paper, these paper will be divided into some parts: Firstly, the introduction that discusses the general understanding of the Islamic political phenomenon in the world politics; Secondly, explaining the secularization perspective on political Islam focusing on Indonesian Muslim narratives; and Lastly, discussing the secularization perspective from the Islamic political perspective.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 *Secularization Perspective on Political Islam*

The secularization perspective or theory is the part of European or western history that emerged after the french revolution or Enlightenment in the eighteenth century. The French revolution had significantly changed the history of western civilization where before the Catholic Church's authority dominated them, intellectually and politically. Then after the revolution, the reason became on the top, which held the authority. The western civilization then was dominated by the regime or sovereignty of reason. Therefore, in the belief of secularization or modernization theory, the history of the human being must come to wind winning the reason instead Religious tradition is perceived as the part of irrationality, a superstition which should not be the regulator of society and will be perished by history and also the reason will get victory in light of the historical destiny. Therefore, in secularization theorists' minds, the domination of reason is just a matter of time. After that, the reason will be the end of history (Fox & Slanders, 2004).

There are some propositions in Secularization theory that remain consistent in use today. First, they are the significant influence on religious change not from within but from external factors. So, every phenomenon happening in religious tradition must be affected by the dynamic of modernity, either economy, politics, or social factors. Second, The secularization process is part of human history that anyone cannot stop and resist. Third, the Secularization theory and paradigm are universal and appropriate to be accepted by all people worldwide. Fourth, Modernity and Religion are very much different from many sides. What modernity wants is to place the human being as the center, anthropocentric, and reason or rationality as the primary thing, on the other hand,

Religion places theology and the will of God as the ultimate goal, which is irrational in a secular perspective (Appleby, Omer, & Little, 2013). This Perspective of secularization has become the dominant ideology of all the scientific production of the western world, either social or natural sciences. Religion should be kicked out of public affairs because this perspective believes that if Religion becomes a part of politics, it will endanger individuals' freedom and finally return to hegemony and authoritarianism in the name of God. Hence, Religion should be in the private sphere (Sandal & James, 2011).

Furthermore, this perspective is used by the western states and intellectuals to understand the dynamics of the Muslim world. In the Secular view, Islam is described as other religions to hinder the rationalization and democratization of society. Edward Said, in his seminal work, *Orientalism*, 1978, describes how the secular perspective of western scholars or orientalist is representing Islam in a pessimistic view. Islam is conceived as an irrational, mystical, anti-modern, tyrannical, and uncivilized religion instead of a legitimate, democratic, and modern one as the fundamental secularization or modernization perspective. Napoleon Bonaparte's colonial mission in Africa and the Middle East in 1798 was influenced by this perspective (Said, 1978).

It is also the same way when secularist conceives the concept of political Islam. Based on secular ontology, Political Islam is conceived as a part of the problem in the modern world. The rise of Islamic political movements and their mission is sometimes assumed to threaten democracy, liberalism, and human rights. On the other side, it is conceived due to the Muslim world's economic, social, and political problems (Hurd, 2008). E. Salla (1997) categorized the two approaches from the secular perspective as the former view is called the essentialist-orientalist approach. The latter is the contingencies-reductionist approach. This idea should be contained by perceiving political Islam as a monolithic threat to democracy, anti-western, and aggressive. Some scholars represent this perspective, Bernard Lewis, Daniel Pipes, Martyn Indyk, and Samuel Huntington. On the one hand, the contingencies approach argues the rise of political Islam due to political, economic, and social conditions in Muslim states. Political Islam, in this perspective, can not be seen as an enemy or adversary but should be freed in politics. This group is represented by scholars like John L Esposito, Edward Said, and James Piscatori (Salla, 1997).

E. Salla (1997) has objected to both views as he mentioned. However, there are two different kinds of looking at Political Islam; both are the same in their position on Political Islam. Islam is just seen as a problem contrasted by the western secular world dan specifically the system of democracy, whether it conforms to democracy or not. E. Salla emphasized that political Islam should be treated as a perspective that has its system of thinking and can not be compromised with other views. Furthermore, Political Islam should be understood as a critic of the failure of western democracy. Perhaps some parts of the concept of political Islam can be adopted to fill the laxities or deficiencies of western liberal politics (Salla, 1997). The same critic also came from Elizabeth Shakhman Hurd. Hurd focuses on the influence of secularism in Western analysis of Islamic politics. Hurd pointed out that the predominantly pessimistic European and American understandings of Islamic politics are caused by their belief in religious and political secularization. This secular attitude is manifested in western society, shaping, inspiring, and influencing their views on Religion and society. The secular view then becomes a set of parameters, the focal point, on which political discourse rotates. Furthermore, this then becomes a strong political power that influences the decision-making process in Western countries.

Hurd (2007) argues that the failure of Western understanding of Islamic politics is because they try to analyze it through the perspective of Western assumptions and epistemology that are not conformed with the body of Islamic knowledge. For example, western secularism believes that Religion should be private and isolated from political life, while there is no separation between private and public life in Islam. Therefore, analyzing Islamic politics through secular epistemology will be misleading and premature understanding (Hurd, 2007).

Hurd (2007) and Salla (1997) have the same conclusion that Political Islam should be placed as an alternative that challenges the ideology of secularism. Political Islam must be understood through its language because it speaks a different language based on a unique and unique epistemology and methodology compared to secular ideology. Once Political Islam is explained through a Secular framework, it may produce negative images of Political Islam (Hurd, 2007; Salla, 1997).

Salla offers a new approach in negotiating between Islamic politics and Western secular views, which he calls the "new convergence thesis." This new perspective, he said, goes beyond the debate between whether Islam is compatible with western political systems, democracy or not. Instead, he stated that "Islamic politics should be seen as a representative paradigm that competes directly with liberal democracy in terms of universal appeal and scope of respective norms." Thus, critics of Islamic politics of democracy or secular politics are placed in the same position as Marxism-Leninism. Salla argues that the conflict between Marxism and capitalism in the cold war era has contributed to the adaptation of several Marxist concepts about the State and political economy in capitalist countries, for example, the rise of the welfare state. Therefore, the relationship between political Islam and the secular world of the West must be seen as the same (Salla, 1997, p. 740).

3.2 Secularist Indonesian Muslims View on Political Islam

In the history of the Indonesian State, the debate about the position of Islam and the State has emerged since the formulation of the Indonesian constitution. The position was then polarized into two groups of perspectives, namely the nationalist and the Islamist. The nationalist group that Soekarno represents believed that Indonesia should not be based on religious doctrine. In comparison, the Islamists represented by Muhammad Natsir, Wahid Hasyim, and many Muslim scholars argued that Islam must be the source of the Indonesian constitution as the obligation of the Muslim to follow Islamic rule for all aspects of human lives. However, this debate finally became a conceptual debate because the nationalists' perspective and proponents had control or dominated the state system and government. This condition has happened in the era of the first Indonesian president, Soekarno, and later, General Soeharto. It even became much worse under the era of President Soeharto (Baswedan, 2004).

After the collapse of the Soeharto regime, the political condition of Indonesia return the intensive debate on the issues of Islam and State in Indonesia, even the debate is more different than before because influenced by transnational Islamic political movement, such as Hizbut Tahrir, Ikhwaanul Muslimin as well as Jihadist Movement. For example, Hizbut Tahrir, as the active transnational organization in Indonesia, not only calls for the implementation of Islamic shariah in Indonesia and all Muslim countries. Furthermore, Hizbut Tahrir calls for re-establishing and uniting all Muslim states in one Islamic State called the Global Khilafah State.

The rise of this new discourse in Islam and state relations is responded differently from many groups in Indonesia. Many of them argue that Indonesia's new Islamic political discourse is a threat to the Indonesian State, nationalism, democracy, and constitution. Many scholars, notably Muslim scholars as to the representative of Muslim groups in Indonesia, reject the concept of the global Islamic State as not conforming to Indonesian people and its tradition where they question the status of the Islamic State concept in Islamic tradition. They all agree that Islam and State are not separated concepts: Politics is inherently the part of Islam,

but in their thinking, Islam does not inherit the fixed concept of a state. It means that All Muslims are free to choose the best type of government system to reach the vision of Islamic teachings like freedom, justice, and prosperity.

The rejection of the Islamic state concept can be seen from the former leader of Nahdlatul Ulama, K.H Abdurrahman Wahid, Gusdur. In his book, *Islamku, Islam Anda, Islam Kita* (2011) noted that Islam never teaches about a fixed concept of a state called an Islamic state. He even worried that if Muslims build a state based on Islam, they will discriminate against other minority religious groups. In Wahid's thinking, Muslims only need to actualize each Muslim people's Islamic character/personality in their activities. Once the Islamic personality has been built in every Muslim, automatically, Muslim people no longer need the Islamic system (Wahid, 2011). Through his thinking on the relations between Islam and State, he emphasized that:

"Karena itu penulis berpendapat, dalam pandangan Islam tidak diwajibkan adanya sebuah sistem Islami, ini berarti tidak ada keharusan untuk mendirikan sebuah negara Islam. Ini penting untuk diingat, karena sampai sekarang pun masih ada pihak-pihak yang ingin memasukkan Piagam Jakarta ke dalam UUD (Undang-Undang Dasar) kita. Dengan klaim mendirikan negara untuk kepentingan Islam jelas bertentangan dengan demokrasi." (Wahid, 2011).

Hence, from the writer's view, in the Islamic perspective, no obligation to build an Islamic state means that Muslims should not effort to invent it. This is an important point to remember because many people today want to try to inject the Jakarta Charter into our constitution. The claim to build a state in the name of Islam contrasts with democracy.

Wahid's argument on the Islamic State is also followed by many scholars and intellectuals in Indonesia, including K.H Hasyim Muzadi, K.H Said Agil Siradj. Muzadi (2014), for instance, said that the concept of Khilafah and its proponents in Indonesia is a threat to the State of Indonesia because the idea is not rooted in Indonesian tradition and culture. Those who constantly struggle to spread and to invent the Islamic State, in Muzadi's opinion, are only troublemakers and disturbers due to their propaganda to delegitimize and deconstruct the sovereign states (Muslimmedianews, 2014). Muzadi has the same view as Wahid as he said that to be truly Islamic is not by constructing an Islamic state, Khilafah Islamiyah.

In Siradj's perspective (2015), the Khilafah state is not needed to solve our state problem. He claimed that the concept of the Indonesian State is better than many Muslim countries, including in the middle east countries, more specifically in holding the commitment of nationalism spirit. The Middle East prolonged conflicts today due to the laxity of nationalism commitment in the Siradj thinking. Accordingly, there is no need to adopt the concept of Khilafah or Islamic State. He stressed that Indonesia would be broken if the Islamic State was built in Indonesia (Republika, 2015).

Many scholars in Indonesia reject the concept of the Islamic State for the reason that the concept is not logical and rational. Even Prophet Muhammad PbuH never tried to invent the Islamic State in Madinah. Madinah Charter is considered an agreement to regulate the social relationship between Muslims and non-Muslim in Madinah. According to Siradj, there is no fixed model of the State in Islam, so the important thing is not the system itself but how to create a good government or good leader (NU Online, 2007).

Meanwhile, Nadirsyah Hosen (2018) emphasized that there is no single system of government in Islam except for government which has a general meaning. Meanwhile, the type of country depends on ijthad or the decision of the Ulama on it. According to Hosen, there were various kinds of countries with the same status as the Khilafah state in Islamic history. The Indonesian political system, according to Hosen, is also the ijthad of the Indonesian ulama, which also deserves to be symbolized as a caliphate with its system and structure. Furthermore, the Khilafah is like any other system, which has its pros and cons. Many of the dark stories in the history of the Khilafah are the same as any other system. Therefore, according to Hosen, claiming the Caliphate as the best single system is not a good choice (Hosen, 2018).

Burhanuddin Muhtadi (2009) also criticizes the Khilafah state's concept as he noted that this concept that has boomed in Indonesia is a threat to the consolidation of democracy in Indonesia. Indonesian people have acknowledged that democracy and nationalism are part of Indonesia. Therefore the concept of Khilafah, which aims to deconstruct democracy and nationalism, is an imminent danger to Indonesia. The perception of threat toward the Islamic state concept simultaneously brings the same perception to all the Islamic movements that always call for implementing the Islamic State in Indonesia (Muhtadi, 2009). Many other books and articles written by many Muslim intellectuals in Indonesia rejected the Islamic State or Khilafah State concept and labeled the proponents as fundamentalist, rigid, and radical in facing the world's current condition. All of them agree on the adaptation of democracy to reach or achieve Islamic ideals while treating the concept of the Islamic State as dangerous ideas and irrelevant in the world today.

3.3 Critical Analysis of The Secularist Arguments

The argument of anti-caliphate or secular narrative is generally the same: first, Islam has not inherited any system of government. Islam only has universal state guidelines, such as the State's obligation to create justice, prosperity, and freedom for the Ummah. Second, historically, there has not been one type of State in Islamic civilization since the era of the four caliphates (Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali). And third, the need to accept the existing political system in the modern Muslim world that has not conflicted with the basic principles of sharia.

This narrative against the idea of a caliphate is not essentially a new thing, but only a repetition of secular and liberal Muslim scholars, such as Ali Abdul Raziq, known as the first scholar to reject the idea of a caliphate and an Islamic state. Ali Abdul Raziq, in his book, *Al-Islam Wa Ushul al-Hukm* (1925), states that he did not find anything in Islam that tells about the Islamic State, in the Koran, or hadith (hadith). The mission of the Prophet Muhammad was only to convey Islamic messages, not to call for the establishment of a state. So, according to Abdul Raziq, there is no problem implementing or adopting any modern state originating from others that Muslims need at any given time (Siregar, 2018).

After publishing his book, many scholars criticized and condemned him. Al-Azhar University scholars have even stated that the book of Raziq is against Islamic teachings. As a result of his book, Raziq was later expelled from his position as a jurist and prohibited from sitting in any Egyptian governmental position. Furthermore, Abdul Raziq's statement was criticized by many scholars other than al-Azhar Ulama, such as Dhiyauddin Rayyis, who wrote a remarkable book in response to this. Meanwhile, Shaykh Muhammad Syakir, Shaykh Yusuf Addijwi, Shaykh Muhammad Bakhit, and Shaykh Muhammad Rasyid Ridha even issued a fatwa to excommunicate Abdul Raziq as no longer a Muslim (Murtad).

Dr. Dhiyauddin Ar-Rayis wrote the book *Al-Islam Wa Al-Khilafah Fi Al- Ashr Al-Hadits* (2002) to answer the book of Raziq. Ar-Rayis argues that Raziq's proposition about Islam and politics is a form of bid'ah (religious innovation) in which not a single Muslim,

either from Sunni, Shia, Kharaj, or even Zindiq, has ever disseminated before. Ar-Rayis stated that the book (*Al-Islam wa Al-Ushul al-Hukm*) attempts to destroy Islamic law, divide Muslims, and allow disobedience to Allah and his Prophet. Including accusing that all Muslims, companions of the Prophet, tabi'in, and mujtahid are stupid or do not know anything about Islam (Ar-Rayis, 2002).

Ar-Rayis explained that it had become a common belief of Muslims that Islam is a comprehensive philosophy that governs the world and religious affairs mentioned in the Koran and Hadith, followed by Muslims from generation to generation. The Khilafah is a political institution that takes precedence from the practice of Muhammad SAW in Medina where he led the people there with one rule, law, and the same goal, namely Islam, where Muslims are required to believe in God, carry out sharia law, jihad, justice, and prosperity. The Prophet Muhammad as the founder of an Islamic state, has shown how to practice Islam as the basis of the State. Rayyis' explanation of Islam and the State or Caliphate refers to al-Mawardi, Ibn Khaldun, and Al-Ghazali (Ar-Rayis, 2002). Al-Mawardi explained that the terminology of the Khilafah and Imamah in an Islamic perspective is an obligation of Muslims, which has become the consensus of all Islamic, Sunni, Shia, Muktazilah, and Kharijites schools. Al-Mawardi defined the concept of the Khilafah as a prophetic successor to protect Islam and regulate or regulate worldly life (Al-Mawardi, n.d.).

The other argument also to reject the Khilafah is from the historical perspective, where those rejectionists said that there is no single kind of Islamic government seen from the diversity of the Muslim State in the history and the difference of succession of caliph after the Prophet. This argument has no scientific proof as it is not so simple as that to conclude the existence of Khilafah from history per se without looking comprehensively and objectively at the political system that existed and was taught by the Prophet PBUH. In reality, the Prophet has shown that the State in Islam should be based on the Islamic shariah, and the role of the State is to perform shariah, to keep the unity of the ummah, to solve the Muslim problems, and to perform da'wah and jihad in spreading Islam. In terms of political succession, the selection of 4 caliphs after the Prophet who is seen to be different is, in fact no different, but it is the result of consultation (musyawarah). Even Umar's election, which is always said to be an appointment, the reality is not, because Abu Bakr had previously consulted Muslim figures like Uthman bin Affan and Abdurrahman bin Auf, then chose Umar as his candidate for the next Caliphate and was accepted by the people by acclamation. In brief, all Muslim scholars agreed that consultation is the main in electing an Islamic political leader, while the method to inaugurate or appoint a caliph is through ba'iah (declaration of allegiance). The argument of the diversity of the Muslim State in history can not also become an argument to delegitimize the existence and the obligation of Khilafah, even the Muslim scholars (Ulema) admitted that the Umayyad, Abbasid, and the Ottoman Caliphates are legitimate as the Islamic Khilafah since their commitment to hold Islam as the basis of State and to perform shariah, to defend Ummah, and to perform da'wah and jihad (Rais, 2001).

The last rejectionist argument that Muslims have the right to choose or *ijtihad* their form of State as long as the State can carry out its duty to fulfill the Islamic principle, justice, freedom, prosperity, and defend the people. The first thing that needs to be clarified here, the process of *ijtihad* is applied to the new issues where the Imam or Mujtahid. They can do that must study deeply, comprehensively the nature of the issue, find its relevancy in Islam, and then conclude its legal status in Islam. Islam and State is not a new thing in Islam, instead it has been a common belief of Muslims that Islam regulates all things, including State and politics, where Islam has obligated to establish a state that implements sharia in the State. The legal status of Khilafah is not also a dispute in Islamic jurisprudence, it has been an *ijma'* or consensus of the Muslim scholars of its status as an obligation for Muslims based on the explanation from Quran, sunnah, and *ijma'* of the Prophet's companion. Hence, the status of Khilafah in Islam as an *ijma'* is like the status of shalat (prayer), shiyam (fasting), Zakat (alms), Hajj (pilgrimage), and other obligations in Islam. As it has been an *ijma'* that those oppose it can be considered as fasiq or even kafir (*murtad*) according to other Ulema (Habieb, 2006).

If, for example, we accept the argument that the Islamic State can change with the change of circumstances, then the question is what kind of State, Muslim will adopt, democracy, monarchy, or socialist State?. None of that three systems can be fitted to the Islamic principles, let alone as the medium to implement the shariah law as those states are the secular form of State that put the people as the sources of law. Indeed, many contemporary scholars allow in adopting democracy as the Muslim form of state. Dr. Yusuf Al-Qaradawy argues that many things in this modern concept conform with the Islamic values, but the State in Islam must place shariah as the only source of law in a state, even democracy in Qaradawy perspective is not like the secular western or the liberal definition of democracy. So, the discussion of Qaradawy on Islam and democracy only on the term, not the substance, like the sovereignty, law, and the obligation of the State that according to him, must follow Islam. From that, we can understand that what Qaradawy expects on the State in Islam is the Islamic State itself that is practiced by the Prophet and his companions, not the secular or western style of State (Al-Qaradawy, 2015). Even if some parts of the secular democracy are similar to the concept of Islam, it is still Islamic principles that make these two systems differ from one another as Abdul Rashid Moten (1996) put it:

"The Islamic political system is distinguished by its unique theoretical foundations and structural features. Terms coined by orientalist like 'theocracy' (a state governed by a god or gods) or 'universal monarchy' (a system based on a legal code) are no proper identification methods if applied to the Islamic political system. Some of the Islamic thoughts and practices can be compared with non-Islamic ones, but the Islamic system '... has a social orientation peculiar to itself, different in many respects from that of the modern West, and can be successfully interpreted only within its context and in its terminology'" (Moten, 1996).

Of all the arguments against the Islamic State and Khilafah idea, none has a strong ideological and methodological basis or scientific basis. It is acceptable since these arguments are against Quranic verses, and prophetic hadith, and consensus of the prophet companions, as well as the consensus of the four main schools in Islamic jurisprudence (Shafi'i, Maliki, Hanafi, and Hanbali) that no doubt of their credibility in Islam as authoritative scholars (mujtahid).

Once again, In the Islamic tradition, when Muslim scholars discuss any issues that regard Islam, they used to use Islamic methodology to analyze and conclude their stance on that issue. Sometimes they do not agree with each other on one issue, but on many issues, they agree. Even though they debate on many issues, they agree on one methodology derived from Islamic sources, known as Ushul Fiqh, where Khilafah is one chapter discussed as the obligation for Muslims to establish. The Islamic State is the only way to implement all the rules of God (sharia). Those scholars based their arguments to establish an Islamic state through their understanding of the concept of Islamic basic law, al-Quran, Sunnah, and consensus (*ijma'*).

Consequently, they all agree that the Islamic State concept is the obligation based on Islamic primary sources. Compared to the secular State, the Islamic State regulates the secular aspect of the State and the religious one. In the secular State, the government has only the responsibility to fulfill the political, economic, security, social, and cultural needs of the people, where morality and religious aspects are privatized to every people. In Islamic perspective, the State protects the secular need of the people and protects the Religion, implements the religious doctrine, and disseminates Islam internally and globally. The process of selecting

the leader is also very much different between Islam and the secular State, where Islam has put religious quality as the first criteria to appoint political leader whereas in democracy, for instance, not including such consideration (Az-Zuhaili, 2011).

This kind of Islamic methodology is not used to discuss or reject the Islamic State concept in many secular Muslim people in Indonesia. Indeed, one clearly understood those rejectionist thinking is that they try to legitimize the existing system based on the secular or modern system. It can be looked at their method in criticizing the concept of the Islamic State in Islam that Islam did not inherit a model of an Islamic state, even if it is established, it would endanger the plurality of society. However, their arguments are always concluded by the effort to compromise the current system, democracy, and nationalism and deconstruct and reinterpret Islamic sources to conform to the modern state system. This is the kind of domination of secularization theory in the Muslim mind today.

According to Abu Sulayman (1993), adopting the secular perspective is a kind of the "*Crisis in Muslim Mind*" that happened since the Muslim people failed to understand the root causes in the Muslim World. They finally tried to adapt or imitate foreign solutions to return the sole the Muslim problems. As a result, instead of making the Muslim ummah better, the condition even becomes worse. Historically, the Ottoman caliphate tried to adopt this modern concept to solve a domestic problems such as economy, politics, social but, this was not useful to return the greatness of this empire. It became worse and worse and ended with the abolishment of the Caliphate instead. What the Muslim needs to solve their problems in Sulayman's opinion is :

Serious and mature Muslim intellectuals and leaders must commit themselves to the one path that is truly open to them, regardless of how difficult it might at first appear to be. They must make sure that the solution they seek originates in their Religion, homeland, and history and that they use it to confront the challenges of the present steadfastly. If this is not done, the bitter failures suffered by the Islamic world over the past several centuries will pale compared to the new problems that it will have to face (Sulayman, 1993).

The use of secularization theory in Islamic discourse is also known as the liberal perspective wherein Indonesia is always represented by the group Jaringan Islam Liberal, Islamic Liberal Network. The central aspect of their thought is adapting and assimilating Western methodology in Islamic thinking. Some of their propaganda is inviting Muslim people to reinterpret the final or fixed doctrines in Islam to be compatible with the modern world. Their thoughts always use the modern concept, for instance, democracy, human rights, nationalism, and liberalism. Mumtaz Ali (2007) contended that adopting the western framework on Islam will produce many kinds of subordination, dependence, and imitation to Western ideology and result in the slavish and defeatist mentality. According to Ali, the subordination of western ideology to the Muslim world will affect the inability of Muslim intellectuals and scholars to construct a new kind of Islamic thinking that can contribute to the Muslim world (Ali, 2007).

From the political perspective, the domination of western secular ideology in the Muslim world will make the Muslim dependent on the western State and politics. In recent times, Palestine, Syria, terrorism-radicalism, poverty, and domestic problems show that very apparently the Muslim people and states can not make significant contribution except only follow the western agenda and international organizations.

In Indonesia, the adoption of secularization theories like democracy and human rights produces many problems for Indonesia. For Muslims, It becomes tough and challenging for Muslim to implement all their Islamic rule in their daily lives except only in limited aspects of Islamic doctrine. As a result, the secular condition and system in Indonesia contribute to the marginalization of Islam in the public sphere. Again, the secular system produces many acute situations such as corruption, crimes, free sex, poverty, and many social illnesses. Unfortunately, Islam that can be constructed to give a solution is prevented from solving all those problems by creating destructive narratives or stigmatization. In conclusion, this is the task of Muslim scholars and intellectuals to construct the solution of Muslim problems through the framework of Islamic methodology and free the Muslim mind from the secular ideology.

4. CONCLUSION

Until nowadays, the debate of the Islamic state concept is not an ending debate but becomes growing mainly as the rise of many global Islamic political movements that try to re-establish the Islamic State at the global level. It is also happening in Indonesia, where many scholars and intellectuals try to respond to the concept and delegitimize it as part of Islamic doctrine and obligation. Many scholars reject and perceive that the concept of the Islamic State is against the notion of nationalism and democracy in Indonesia because it is considered to bring danger to Indonesian political life.

Those arguments, however are trapped by the framework of western ideology and secularization theory or perspective. This secular concept assumes that Religion has to be separated by the State, so there is no religious state. In the secular perspective, what the people have to establish is a secular state where democracy, nationalism, and human rights are part of the state system. The anti-Islamic State in Indonesia always uses these secular arguments to reject the concept of the Islamic State.

In discussing Islamic issues, The scholars use the scientific method inherited by the Islamic tradition itself, namely, exploring the primary sources of Islam, Al-Quran, Sunnah, ijma, the consensus of the sahabah (prophet companions) to conclude issues in Islam. This methodology secures the process and the result of the thinking process from the influence of external factors.

References

- Al-Mawardi. (n.d.). *Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah*. London: Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd.
- Al-Qaradawy, Y. (2015). *Fiqh Daulah dalam Perspektif Islam*. Selangor Darul Ehsan: Syabab Publishing.
- Ali, M. M. (2007). Liberal Islam: An Analysis. *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, 24(2), 44–70.
- Amsori, E. (2019). Khilafah Islamiah in International Islamic Political Perspective. Jakarta.
- Appleby, R. S., Omer, A., & Little, D. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Religion, Conflict and Peacebuilding* (pp. 386–388). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ar-Rayis, M. D. (2002). *Islam dan Khilafah di Zaman Modern*. Jakarta: Lentera.
- Az-Zuhaili, W. (2011). *Fiqh Islam Wa Adillatuhu: Jilid 8*. Darul Fikir.
- Baswedan, A. R. (2004). Political Islam in Indonesia: Present and Future Trajectory. *Asian Survey*, 44(5), 669–690.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dardiri, A. H. (2017). Konsepsi Pembagian Kekuasaan Negara Islam Khilafah Menurut Hizbut Tahrir dan Kemungkinan Implementasinya di Indonesia. *Millah*, 15(2), 272–304.
- Esposito, J. L., & John O. Voll. (2001). *Makers of Contemporary Islam*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Fox, J., & Sandler, S. (2004). *Bringing Religion into International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Habieb, S. A. (2006). *Persepakatan Ulama dalam Hukum Islam: Ensiklopedia Ijmak*. Jakarta: Pustaka Firdaus.
- Hosen, N. (2018). *Islam Yes Khilafah No*. Yogyakarta: Suka Press.
- Hurd, E. S. (2007). Political Islam and foreign policy in Europe and the United States. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2007.00054.x>
- Hurd, E. S. (2008). *The politics of Secularization in International Relations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Ismail, Mahyudin Ritonga, Irfan Ahmad, Slamet Fardyanto, M. I. (2020). Demystifying Khilafah Government and Democracy. *Journal of University of Shanghai for Science and Technology*, 22(11), 233–246.
- Moten, A. R. (1996). *Political Science: An Islamic Perspective*. London: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Muhtadi, B. (2009). The quest for hizbut tahrir in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 37(4), 623–645. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853109X460219>
- Muslimmedianews. (2014). Pandangan KH. Hasyim Muzadi terhadap Gerakan Khilafah. Retrieved December 15, 2015, from <http://www.muslimmedianews.com/2014/03/pandangan-kh-hasyim-muzadi-terhadap.html>.
- Ningsih, Mohammad Zainal Hamdy, W. P. (2020). Telaah Kembali Pemahaman Sistem Ketata Negara dalam Islam (Khilafah): Kajian Historis dan Ideologis terhadap Gerakan HTI di Indonesia. *SYAIKHUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pranata Islam STAI Syichona Moh. Cholil Bangkalan*, 11(2), 158–172.
- NU Online. (2007). PBNU: Konsep Khilafah Islamiyah Tidak Pernah Jelas. Retrieved December 15, 2015, from <http://www.nu.or.id/a,public-m,dinamic-s,detail-ids,1-id,9731-lang,id-c,warta-t,PBNU++Konsep+Khilafah+Islamiyah+Tidak+Pernah+Jelas-phpx>
- Rais, D. M. D. (2001). *Teori Politik Islam*. Jakarta: Gema Insani Press.
- Republika. (2015). NU Tolak Wacana Khilafah Islamiah di Indonesia. Retrieved December 15, 2020, from <https://www.republika.co.id/berita/nasional/umum/15/05/25/nowfcm-nu-tolak-wacana-khilafah-islamiah-di-indonesia>
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Salla, M. E. (1997). Political Islam and the West: A new cold war or convergence? *Third World Quarterly*, 18(4), 729–742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436599714731>
- Sandal, N. A., & James, P. (2011). Religion and international relations theory: Towards a mutual understanding. *European Journal of International Relations*, 17(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066110364304>
- Siregar, S. (2018). Khilafah Islam dalam Perspektif Sejarah Pemikiran Ali Abdul Raziq. *JUSPI: Jurnal Sejarah Peradaban Islam*, 2(1), 124–137.
- Sulayman, A. H. A. (1993). *Crisis in the Muslim Mind*. Virginia: The International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Sykiainen, L. (2017). The Islamic Concept of The Caliphate: Basic Principles and A Contemporary Intepretation. *Islamology*, 7(1), 62–70.
- Thomas, J. (2014). The Islamic State's Rivals in Syria Reject Announced Caliphate. Retrieved December 15, 2020, from http://www.longwarjournal.org/archives/2014/07/the_islamic_states_r.php
- Tomi Setiawan, A. R. (2019). Negara Modern dan Utopia Khilafah(?). *Jurnal Kajian Peradaban Islam*, 2(2), 6–19.
- Voll, J. O. (2007). Islam and Democracy: Is Modernization a Barrier? *Religion Compass*, 1, 170–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8171.2006.00017.x>
- Wahid, A. (2011). *Islamku, Islam Anda, Islam Kita : Agama Masyarakat Negara Demokrasi, Digital Edition*. Jakarta: Democracy Project.